

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF PRESIDENT PEEVEY**

(Mailed 7/11/2014)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) for Adoption of its Smart Grid Deployment Plan.

Application 11-06-006  
(Filed June 6, 2011)

And Related Matters.

Application 11-06-029  
Application 11-07-001

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN  
COALITION AND LATINO BUSINESS CHAMBER OF GREATER  
LOS ANGELES FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO  
DECISION 13-07-024**

<b>Claimant: Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater L.A.</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 13-07-024</b>
<b>Claimed (\$): \$24,248</b>	<b>Awarded (\$): \$6,906.30 (Reduced by 71.52%)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Timothy J. Sullivan</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b>	Decision (D.) 13-07-024 is the culmination of the presentation and review of the Smart Grid Deployment Plan (SGDP) submitted by each of the three major electricity investor owned utilities in California (San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), Pacific Gas and
------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Electric Company (PG&E), and Southern California Edison Company (SCE)). D.13-07-024 found that each of the plans was consistent with the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 17 and the requirements the Commission adopted in D.10-06-047. The decision declined to adopt any additional requirements suggested by any of the non-utility parties.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812:**

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	September 7, 2011	Verified
2. Other Specified Date for Notice of Intent (NOI):	---	
3. Date NOI Filed:	September 30, 2011	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.)10-12-005/006	Not accepted
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 14, 2011	Not accepted
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	---	
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, see comment below
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.10-12-005/006	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 14, 2011	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	---	
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes

Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D. 13-07-024	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	August 2, 2013	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	September 30, 2013	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?	Yes	

**C. Additional Comments on Part I:**

7

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
8		x	<p><b>Showing of Customer or Customer-Related Status</b></p> <p>Joint Parties rely on the November 14, 2011 ruling in A.10-12-005/-006 to address their showing of customer or customer-related status (November 14 Ruling). The November 14, 2011 Ruling acknowledged the July 8, 2011 ruling in A.10-11-015 directing the Joint Parties to submit signed amended bylaws when the Joint Parties file a request for intervenor compensation. Based on the July 8, 2011 ruling and the amended NOI filed in A.10-11-015, the November 14, 2011 Ruling determined that the Joint Parties demonstrated status as a “customer” for purposes of this proceeding. This preliminary determination of customer eligibility would be supported only when Joint Parties submitted signature pages reflecting the adoption of its amended bylaws.</p> <p>On May 12, 2014, the LBCGLA submitted signed bylaws, meeting the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer. On May 16, 2014, the NAAC submitted signed amendments to its bylaws, meeting the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer. The BEC does not have signed bylaws on file with the Commission and as of the issuance date of this award decision, has not satisfied the requirements of Public Utilities Code § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers.</p> <p>As noted below, the amount of the total award granted on this claim is the same as that which would have been granted if BEC were also found to be a customer. However, the award is granted to LBCGLA and NAAC only, because BEC has not been found to be a customer.</p>
16		x	<p><b>Timeliness of Filing</b></p> <p>When a compensation request is not filed in compliance with the statutory</p>

		<p>requirements and any applicable additional requirements, it is deemed incomplete.<sup>1</sup> The request is deemed complete on May 16, 2014, when the NAAC submitted eligibility documentation required by the July 8, 2011 ruling in A.10-11-015.</p> <p>The Commission, through decisions, has adopted, and applied a policy of awarding interest from the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the date of the filing of a complete compensation request. If a compensation request is not filed in compliance with the statute and any applicable additional requirements, and an amendment is necessary to bring that request into compliance, then interest should accrue from the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the date the amendment to the request for compensation was filed. <i>See</i> D. 98-04-059 at 51.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---

<sup>1</sup> *See* Decision 98-04-059 at 51.

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION****A. Claimant's contribution to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).**

<b>Intervenor's Claimed Contribution</b>	<b>Specific References to Claimant's Presentations and to Decision</b>	<b>CPUC Comments</b>
<p><b>1. Community Outreach and Engagement</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties argued for, among other recommendations, a 5% funding allocation for outreach and community education programs, and that this should be allocated primarily to community-based organizations that focus on underserved and low-income communities. Though the Commission deferred review of community outreach plans, it did mention that this review should not be done in the abstract and left open the Joint Parties' suggestions.</p> <p>Although the Commission ultimately did not adopt the Joint Parties' recommendations, the Joint Parties' time invested in this issue should be duly compensated in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1802(i), where they "substantially assisted the Commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer."</p> <p>Furthermore, pursuant to §1802(i), the Joint Parties believe that in many instances their "participation has resulted in substantial contribution, even if the decision adopt[ed] that customer's contention or recommendation only in part. . . ."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. 13-07-024, at 90, 104-105.</li> <li>• Joint Motion for Party Status (July 7, 2011), at 1-2.</li> <li>• Response of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA to the Applications for approval of Smart Grid Deployment Plans (Aug. 4, 2011), at 1-3.</li> <li>• Analysis of the NAAC, BECD, and LBCGLA of the Smart Grid Deployment Plans (Oct. 13, 2011), at 6-10.</li> <li>• Comments of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA on the Smart Grid Deployment Workshop (March 12, 2012), at 4-6.</li> <li>• Reply Comments of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA on the Smart Grid Deployment Workshop (March 22, 2012), at 5-6.</li> <li>• Comments of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA on the Proposed Decision (July 1, 2013), at 1-3.</li> </ul>	<p>Not accepted. Decision 13-07-024 concluded that the time to review community outreach and engagement was not in this proceeding but should be considered in conjunction with specific programs, not here in the abstract.</p>

<p><b>2. Diversity and General Order (GO) 156</b></p> <p>Though the Joint Parties and the CPUC Staff Report were in concurrence as to the importance of workforce development, and in spite of the Joint Parties' repeated urging to adopt a metric for tracking GO 156 progress, the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) stated its belief that the time was not yet right to address these issues and they should not be examined "in the abstract." (D. 13-07-024, at 105).</p> <p>Although the Commission ultimately did not adopt the Joint Parties' recommendations, the Joint Parties' time invested in this issue should be duly compensated in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1802(i), where they "substantially assisted the Commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer."</p> <p>Furthermore, pursuant to §1802(i), the Joint Parties believe that in many instances their "participation has resulted in substantial contribution, even if the decision adopt[ed] that customer's contention or recommendation only in part. . . ."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. 13-07-024, p. 90.</li> <li>• Joint Motion for Party Status (July 7, 2011), at 2.</li> <li>• Response of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA to the Applications for Approval of Smart Grid Deployment Plans (Aug. 4, 2011), at 4.</li> <li>• Analysis of the NAAC, BECD, and LBCGLA of the Smart Grid Deployment Plans (Oct. 13, 2011), at 3-5.</li> <li>• Comments of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA on the Smart Grid Deployment Workshop (March 12, 2012), at 2-4.</li> <li>• Comments of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA on the Proposed Decision (July 1, 2013), at 4.</li> </ul>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>D.13-07-024 concluded that the time to review GO 156 was not in this proceeding but in conjunction with specific programs when approved by the Commission, not here in the abstract.</p>
<p><b>3. General Issues and Procedural Requirements</b></p> <p>This category includes procedural requirements, reviewing briefs of other parties or filings related to procedural or discovery issues, as well as motion practice (for example, the Joint Parties motion to compel, and motion to</p>	<p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA of the Smart Grid Deployment Plans (Oct. 13, 2011), at 2-3.</li> <li>• Reply Comments of the NAAC, BEC, and LBCGLA</li> </ul>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The Joint Parties' time submitted under general issues and procedural requirements is reduced by 50%</p>

accept supplemental testimony). Furthermore, among the general proposals put forth was the Joint Parties' suggestion of the creation of a Ratepayer Security Expert Fund to aid intervenors in the hiring of experts in technical matters.	on the Smart Grid Deployment Workshop (March 22, 2012), at 2-4.	because of lack of substantial contribution to D.13-07-024 as discussed in Part II(A)(1) and Part II (A)(2). Comments on the Ratepayer Security Expert Fund are disallowed for being outside the scope for the proceeding. 50% of the Joint Parties' hours under general issues and procedural requirements are allowed for general coordination and comments on procedure, but hours allocated to clerical tasks are disallowed.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):**

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>	Verified
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Verified

<sup>2</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b></p> <p>The Greenlining Institute</p>	Verified
<p><b>d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties. The work of the Joint Parties did not overlap with other parties, even when addressing the same issue. For example, though the greenlining Institute advocated for ensuring that GO 156 goals were met, the Joint Parties advanced several distinct and specific courses of action for the commission, including the inclusion of a small business metric and advocating for expanded technical assistance. Furthermore, the Joint Parties advocated for higher aspirational goals for diverse business contract in the context of Smart Grid outreach.</p> <p>With regard to expanded community outreach, the Joint Parties were unique in their approach, by suggesting a 5% allocation of funding to ensure that underserved communities were adequately addressed in Smart Grid outreach. The Joint Parties also stressed having community buy-in in advance of the deployment, as much as possible.</p>	Though work of the Joint Parties did not substantially overlap with other parties, the issues the Joint Parties focused on were outside the scope of the proceeding.

### PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

#### A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

<p><b>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant's participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)</b></p> <p>The Joint Parties' advocacy reflected in D. 13-07-024 addressed broad policy matters from the perspective of low-income communities and communities of color. For the most part, the Joint Parties cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from their work related to D. 13-07-024, given the nature of the issues presented.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Joint Parties' issues are not conducive to easy quantification of benefit. The issues raised, and the benefits that accrue from competent community outreach and education, as well as supplier diversity, are not readily quantifiable.</p>	<p><b>CPUC Verified</b></p> <p>No benefits from the Joint Parties' work in A.11-06-006 are found in D.13-07-024. The decision concluded that this proceeding was not the time to discuss GO 156 or community outreach. The decision found that IOUs will provide outreach plans, where necessary, that are appropriately tailored to the program or service for which Commission authorization is sought, not here.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.**

This Request for Compensation includes approximately 86 total hours for the Joint Parties' attorneys and staff. The Joint Parties submit that this is a reasonable amount of time, given the issues examined, as well as their importance to underserved communities, which resulted in D. 13-07-024. These hours were devoted to substantive pleadings as well as to procedural matters.

The Joint Parties' request also includes 7.7 hours devoted to the preparation of this request for compensation. Mr. Lewis prepared this claim, avoiding the need for any of Mr. Gnaizda's time, which is several times more costly.

The Joint Parties' hours claimed are largely unreasonable because of their lack of substantial contribution to the decision.

Additionally, Faith Bautista's hours were unreasonable because they were not properly recorded with dates. Furthermore Bautista's hours were unreasonable because the description of Bautista's activities were that of time acting as a client rather than a consultant or advocate.

**c. Allocation of Hours by Issue**

A. Community Outreach and Education	35.2%
B. Supplier Diversity	14.1%
C. General Issues and Procedural Requirements	50.7%
Total	100%

This allocation of hours by issue accurately reflects those of the time sheets provided.

**B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Robert Gnaizda	2011	14.6	\$535	D.12-07-15	\$7,811	3.55	\$535	\$1,899.25
Shalini Swaroop	2011	45.05	\$215	Attachment C	\$9,685.75	11.66	\$180	\$2,098.80
Shalini Swaroop	2012	19.6	\$220	Attachment C	\$4,312	5.05	\$185	\$934.25

Aaron Lewis	2013	4.3	\$195	Attachment H	\$838.5	.65	\$180	\$117
Faith Bautista	2011	2.7	\$300	Attachment D	\$810	0	\$150	\$0
				<i>Subtotal:</i>	\$23,457.25	<i>Subtotal:</i>		\$5,049.30
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Aaron Lewis	2013	7.7	\$97.5		\$750.75	7.7	\$90	\$693
Shalini Swaroop	2011					1.6	\$90	\$144
Subtotal:					\$750.75		Subtotal:	\$837
COSTS								
#	Item		Detail					
	Printing		Printing costs for Commission rulings, internal drafts, other parties' filings, etc.		\$40			\$10.20
Subtotal:					\$40	Subtotal:		\$10.20
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$24,248	TOTAL AWARD \$:		\$6,906.30

<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Member Number</b>	<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation</b>
Robert Gnaizda	January 9, 1962	32148	No
Shalini Swaroop	June 11, 2010	270609	No
Aaron Lewis	December 15, 2012	285526	No

**C. CPUC Disallowances, Adjustments, and Comments:**

<b>#</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>2011 Hourly Rate of Robert Gnaizda</b>	The Joint Parties seek the hourly rate of \$535, as adopted in D.12-07-015, for Robert Gnaizda’s work here. We apply this previously adopted rate to this award.
<b>2011 and 2012 Hourly Rate for Shalini Swaroop</b>	<p>The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$215 for Shalini Swaroop’s work performed in 2011 and \$220 for Swaroop’s work performed in 2012 in this proceeding. An hourly rate for Shalini Swaroop has not been adopted by the Commission in the past. Swaroop became a licensed member of the California bar in June of 2010 and had approximately one year of experience as a licensed attorney when she began work in this proceeding, none of this previous experience took place before the Commission. We base Swaroop’s new rates on the 2011 rate described in Resolution ALJ-281 for attorney intervenors in the Swaroop’s experience range. The Commission adopts an hourly rate of \$180 for Swaroop in 2011.</p> <p>We apply the 2.2% Cost Of Living Adjustment adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$185 for Swaroop’s 2012 work.</p>
<b>2011 Hourly Rate for Advocate Faith Bautista</b>	The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$300 for Faith Bautista’s work in 2011. The Commission adopted a 2011 hourly rate for Bautista of \$150 in D.12-07-015 and we apply it to her work here.
<b>2013 Hourly Rate for Aaron Lewis</b>	The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$195 for Aaron Lewis’ work performed in 2013. Lewis became a licensed member of the California Bar

<sup>3</sup> This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

	in December of 2012. Prior to becoming a licensed attorney in December 2012, the Commission adopted a 2011 hourly rate for Lewis, a legal intern, of \$90 in D.12-07-015. For Lewis' 2013 work in A11-06-006, with 0 years of experience as a licensed attorney, we adopt an hourly rate of \$180 pursuant to Res. ALJ-287's table of Hourly Intervenor Rate Ranges.
<b>Disallowance of Hours for Robert Gnaizda</b>	Robert Gnaizda's hours designated on the Joint Parties' time sheet as pertaining to their issues of Community Outreach and Supplier Diversity/GO 156 have been disallowed for lack of substantial contribution. D. 13-07-024 concluded that these efforts were not within the scope of the proceeding and these issues were not included in the scoping memo. Also, two of Gnaizda's time records were recorded for 10/12/13 and 10/13/13, after the issuance of the D.13-07-024. After careful review of Joint Parties' time sheets we have determined that these activities took place on 10/12/11 and 10/13/11 and have given partial compensation for this time. Gnaizda's time spent on general issues and procedural requirements has been reduced by 50% for lack of substantial contribution.
<b>Disallowance of Hours for Shalini Swaroop</b>	Shalini Swaroop's hours have been reduced by 1 hour for clerical work filing and serving comments, scheduling, and managing the service list. Swaroop's hours preparing for the workshops have been disallowed for lack of substantial contribution and Swaroop is compensated for three hours spent at the workshop at 50% of her hourly rate to reflect the lack of contribution or active participation. Swaroop's requested time working on intervenor compensation activities have been reallocated for compensation under Intervenor Compensation Preparation to be compensated at 50% of her hourly rate. Swaroop's remaining hours designated on Joint Parties' time sheet as pertaining to their issues of Community Outreach and Supplier Diversity/GO 156 have been disallowed for lack of substantial contribution. D. 13-07-024 concluded that these efforts were not within the scope of the proceeding and these issues were not included in the scoping memo. Swaroop's time spent on general issues and procedural requirements has been reduced by 50% for lack of substantial contribution.
<b>Disallowance of Hours for Aaron Lewis</b>	Aaron Lewis' hours have been reduced by .3 for clerical work filing and serving opening comments that is not compensable. Lewis' remaining time is reduced by 2.7 hours. This is time designated on the Joint Parties' time sheet as pertaining to their issues of Community Outreach and Supplier Diversity/ GO 156. D.13-07-024 concluded that these efforts were not within the scope of the proceeding and these issues were not included in the scoping memo. Lewis' time spent on general issues and procedural requirements has been reduced by 50% for lack of substantial contribution.
<b>Disallowance of Faith Bautista's Hours</b>	No dates were included on Faith Bautista's time sheet. Dates must be included with all activities on time sheets for hours to be deemed valid. Additionally, review of the record and the activity descriptions on the time sheets leads to the conclusion that Bautista's requested hours are

	inappropriate. Bautista appears to be billing for her time acting as a client rather than as a consultant and she did not give any testimony in the proceeding. All of Bautista's requested hours are disallowed.
<b>Disallowance of Printing Expenses</b>	Costs claimed over \$20 must be accompanied by an itemized receipt. The Joint Parties were notified by email on June 3, 2014, to provide such a receipt by June 6, 2014. No receipt was provided. The printing charges requested are unreasonable because The Joint Parties only filed a total of 102 pages (including certificates of service) and The Joint Parties failed to provide an appropriate receipt that itemized the costs incurred. Printing compensation has been calculated at the reasonable rate of \$0.10 a page for \$10.20 in compensation.

#### PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

**Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (see § 1804(c))**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No
-------------------------------------------------------	----

<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?</b>	No
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition
	No Comments were filed.	

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA rely on the July 8, 2011 ALJ ruling in A.10-11-015 to support their claim as eligible as Category 3 customers in their NOI in A.10-12-005 and A.10-12-006.
2. The July 8, 2011 ALJ ruling in A.10-11-015 required BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA to submit signed bylaws with their claim in A.10-11-015 to uphold its preliminary finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers, defined by § 1802(b)(1).
3. BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA did not file signed bylaws in A.10-11-015, thereby invalidating the July 8, 2011 ruling making the parties' preliminarily eligible as Category 3 customers.

4. On May 12, 2014, LBCGLA submitted signed bylaws completing the statutory requirements of § 1802(b)(1) and establishing eligibility as a Category 3 customer
5. On May 16, 2014, NAAC submitted signed bylaws completing the statutory requirements of § 1802(b)(1) and establishing eligibility as a Category 3 customer.
6. BEC has yet to file its signed amended bylaws with the Commission.
7. BEC's failure to submit its signed bylaws prevents it from establishing customer eligibility under § 1802(b)(1).
8. BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA have made a substantial contribution to D.13-07-024 but only LBCGLA and NAAC are customers eligible for compensation, pursuant to § 1802(b)(1).
9. The hourly rates for the representatives of BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA as adjusted herein, are comparable to the market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services, and consistent with the past hourly rates awarded to BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA representatives.
10. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
11. The total of reasonable compensation is \$6,906.30.

### **CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812.

### **ORDER**

1. National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles is awarded \$6,906.30.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2011 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning July 30, 2014, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of

Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles' request was completed, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

## APPENDIX

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1307024		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A1106006, A1106029, A1107001		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Timothy Sullivan		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company		

## Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles.	09/30/2013  Date of Completed Filing: 5/16/2014	\$24,248	\$6,906.30	No	Award only to National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles. No award to Black Economic Council for lack of statutory eligibility. Disallowances for lack of substantial contribution on certain issues, clerical tasks, duplication of effort, incomplete timesheets, unreasonable hours, and adjusted hourly rates.

## Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$535	2011	\$535

Shalini	Swaroop	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$215	2011	\$180
Shalini	Swaroop	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$215	2012	\$185
Aaron	Lewis	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$195	2013	\$180
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	National Asian American Coalition	\$350	2011	\$150
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	National Asian American Coalition	\$350	2012	\$155

**(END OF APPENDIX)**